

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully considered the August 30, 2005 Office Action, and the amendments above together with the comments that follow are presented in a bona fide effort to address all issues raised in that Action and thereby place this case in condition for allowance. Claims 1-19 were pending in this application. In response to the Office Action dated August 30, 2005, claim 18 has been canceled and claims 1, 15, 16 and 19 have been amended. New dependent claim 20 has been added. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Adequate descriptive support for the present Amendment should be apparent throughout the originally filed disclosure as, for example, the depicted embodiments (Figs. 5 & 6) and related discussion thereof in the written description of the specification.

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lunbald et al. (WO 00/23952, hereinafter “Lunbald”) in view of Katou et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,481,620, hereinafter “Katou”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The present claimed subject matter, as described in claim 1, recites a banknote handling device comprising a notification module that notifies the customer of predetermined kind of information. The information provided for the customer, in the notification, is indicative of a total amount of money received from the customer and is indicative of an amount of money settled as a transaction; regardless of the result of the counterfeit detection by the discrimination module. In contrast, Lunbald discloses a banknote handling machine which prints customer information and information relating to suspect banknotes on the packaging material. Thus, Lunbald fails to disclose or remotely suggest a notification module wherein the information is indicative of a total amount of money received from the customer and an amount of money

settled as a transaction; regardless of the result of the counterfeit detection by the discrimination module.

Moreover, the Examiner asserted that a notification module is well known in the art, and that Katou teaches a statement processing mechanism 102 corresponding to the notification module as defined in claim 1. However, claim 1 describes, in pertinent part, a notification module that notifies the customer of predetermined kind of information indicative of a total amount of money received from the customer and an amount money settled as a transaction, regardless of the result of the counterfeit detection by the discrimination module. This claim limitation, as described in claim 1, is neither disclosed nor fairly suggested by the Katou. Rather, Katou merely discloses a statement notification that notifies the customer of the total amount of money handled by the handling machine, but fails to disclose or suggest a notification module that notifies the customer of predetermined kind of information indicative of a total amount of money received from the customer and an amount money settled as a transaction, regardless of the result of the counterfeit detection by the discrimination module. Thus, Katou fails to disclose or remotely suggest the notification module of claim 1, as amended.

Accordingly, neither reference, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests every limitation of claim 1. As such, independent claim 1, as well as its respective dependent claims, are patentable over any possible combination of applied art.

Moreover, independent claims 15 and 16, as amended, are patentable over the applied art. The subject matter of claim 18 has been added to each of claims 15 and 16. Claim 18 has been canceled and the dependency of claim 19 has been amended in view of the cancellation of claim 18. Claims 15 and 16 both recite a banknote handling device that comprises, *inter alia*, a management module that manages customer information for identifying each customer who

handles a transaction, mapped to presence or absence of any counterfeit banknote involved in the transaction.

The art rejection failed to identify a management module of the type recited in original claim 18, in Lunbald or Katou. Applicants respectfully submit that neither cited document discloses or suggests a management module that manages customer information for identifying each customer who handles a transaction, mapped to presence or absence of any counterfeit banknote involved in the transaction. Therefore, the cited Lunbald and Katou documents, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to identically describe every limitation of either of independent claims 15 and 16. Hence, claims 15 and 16 and the claims that depend therefrom patentably distinguish over Lunbald and Katou as applied in the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-17 and 19-20 are free from the applied art and, therefore the imposed rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Applicants have reviewed the specification for minor errors, but no changes are believed necessary at the present time.

It is believed that pending claims 1-17 and 19-20 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' representative at the telephone number shown below.

Application No.: 10/743,305

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Brian K. Seidleck
Registration No. 51,321

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 BKS:idw
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: November 28, 2005

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**